



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ist der Titel von Schillers erstem Drama.' Abundant materials in the hand of the reviewer indicate that the plural of the verb is more common here : '*Die Erbschleicher*' sind ein ungeheuerliches Werk (Rudolf Schlösser's *F. W. Gotters Leben und Werke*, p. 269). Schnaffners '*Irrfahrten*' sind ein zartes, tief empfundenes Buch (Edmund Lange in *Die schöne Literatur*, 9. Sept. 1905). In the 10th edition of Wetzel's *Die deutsche Sprache*, p. 275, we find *Der Räuber ist ein Schauspiel von Schiller*, but in the 12th edition the plural of the verb is recommended. In general the trend here is toward the plural. On the other hand it seems quite inconsistent that the singular verb is uniformly employed if the title is a couple of proper nouns linked by *und* : *Romeo und Julie wird heute gegeben*. The plural name of a German newspaper requires the plural form of the verb : *Die 'Hamburger Nachrichten' erscheinen täglich dreimal*. In case of a foreign newspaper we sometimes, perhaps in imitation of the foreign idiom, find the singular here : '*Es kann nicht klar genug gesagt werden*,' SCHREIBT die '*Times*' (*Hamburger Nachrichten*, 27. Okt. 1904). *Die Schlüsse, welche die 'Times' ZIEHT, werden gewiß in Frankreich nicht geteilt* (*Frankfurter Zeitung*, 31. März 1905). W. does not speak of this usage in connection with names of boats. The verb is here regularly in the plural if the name is in the plural : *Die 'Zwei Gebrüder' HATTEN die Hohewegsbalje unter dem Hohenwegsleuchtturm bereits erreicht* (Hermann Rückner's *Küstenfahrer*, chap. 1). To an English-speaking student this construction is very queer indeed and seems a needless concession to form at the expense of the thought.

GEORGE O. CURME.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY.

English Literature From the Norman Conquest to Chaucer. By William Henry Schofield, Ph. D., Professor of Comparative Literature in Harvard University. The Macmillan Company, 1906, 500 pages.

Professor Schofield's *English Literature From the Norman Conquest to Chaucer* is likely to prove a serviceable book and to stimulate intelligent interest in a period of English literature often

neglected and misunderstood. Many specialists and many 'gentle readers' have long needed just such a book as Professor Schofield has written. The brilliant chapters in Ten Brink's celebrated History, although still inspiring on account of their enthusiasm, insight, and imaginative grasp, are now inadequate. Since that great scholar laid aside his pen for the last time, much has been done to modify and to correct his conclusions. Moreover, the well known histories of the period that have followed Ten Brink's are for one reason or another unsatisfactory. By avoiding their shortcomings and by writing pleasantly, Professor Schofield has produced a book that deserves a prominent place on the shelves of both the scholar and the general reader.

The book is, first of all, orderly and interesting. Its general plan, like that followed by Paris in his "*Littérature Française au Moyen Age*," is reasonable in every way. According to this arrangement the material is conveniently classified with reference to literary kinds. The advantages of this method over the chronological scheme adopted by Brandl are obvious. Where Brandl is confusing Schofield is clear. Surely, too, the literary type—romance or fabliau—is of more vital interest than those questions of chronology and dialect that are often so hard to answer. With characteristic tact, Professor Schofield does not tease his readers with such problems. Nor does he vex them with a mere enumeration of titles, which is likely to be as engaging to many thoughtful persons as Homer's catalogue of ships. It may, on the whole, be safely said that he has been uncommonly successful in eschewing what for the general reader is tedious and in emphasizing what for all men is interesting.

It is to be regretted that a book which has so much to recommend it should not be characterized throughout by precision of style. Here and there Professor Schofield is likely to mislead many readers to whom his book as a whole will strongly appeal. To say, for instance, that 'Anglo-Saxon authors were then [at the time of the Conquest] as suddenly and as permanently displaced as Anglo-Saxon kings,' (p. 1) is to say something which is clearly inaccurate. It seems probable, to be sure, that a century after the Conquest Anglo-Saxon was a language by no means generally familiar to Englishmen of education. But it is not true that no Anglo-Saxon literature was produced after the Conquest. The English Chronicle

lived on until 1154. Here clearly, is work, which, under any reasonable interpretation of the phrase, was done by 'Anglo-Saxon authors.' Besides, it is altogether likely that we have very meager records of the literature of the Transition Period. Who can doubt that much work done by 'Anglo-Saxon authors' during these troubled years has perished? It is well to note, in this connection, that William the Conqueror was by no means hostile to the native speech. With no active opposition to the production of Anglo-Saxon literature, there is no reason in the nature of things why it should not have been produced. We can say no more than Brandl has said: 'Dass nach hundert Jahren die alte Schriftsprache samt den darin niedergelegten Produktionen den Engländern entfremdet wurde';¹—or than Morsbach: 'Die Eroberung Englands durch die Normannen hatte der Herrschaft der WS. Schriftsprache ein jähes Ende bereitet.'²

Professor Schofield reiterates in his book opinions which he has expressed before but which have failed to win wide approval. He still holds that the *Pearl* is simply an 'untarnished eulogy of Maidenhood' (p. 381). He says nothing of 'a little grave, a nameless man's distress.' In this omission of any mention of the usual interpretation of the poem he is at fault, whatever may be his own opinion. Moreover, Professor Schofield has not proved his case. His ingenious article upon the *Pearl* is characteristically fresh in conception, but it fails to convince. The poem strikes clearly the note of personal grief and it contains passages that are obviously autobiographical. It has been sensibly noted that the conventionality of the *Pearl*, its machinery of the mediæval vision poetry, does not disqualify it as an elegy.³

More than a third of Professor Schofield's text is devoted to the Romances. This is, perhaps, the most valuable section of the book. One may safely say that it is an admirably concise, interesting, and accurate treatment of the subject. In one or two places, however, the author seems to be in error. Writing of the *Horn Child* he says: 'One of the most striking scenes of *Horn Child*,

¹ Paul's *Grundriss*, II, 614.

² *Mittelenglische Grammatik*, I, Anm. 5.

³ *Recent Studies of The Pearl*, Clark S. Northup, *M. L. N.*, 21-22. See, too, *In Defense of 'Pearl,'* G. G. Coulton, *The Modern Language Review*, II, 39 ff.

that at the banquet, was perpetuated in several Scottish ballads called *Hind Horn*, still current it may be in remote parts' (p. 265). If he means here to reaffirm his opinion that the Horn ballads are derived from the Romance, the sentence quoted may well give us pause. There are very few ballads that are certainly derived from Romances. Unless, then, we have a strong argument to the contrary, we rightly assume that the Horn ballads were independent of the *Horn Child*. Professor Schofield's reasons for the contrary assumption are neither compelling nor precise.¹ In the meanwhile the late Professor Child's words stand : 'The likeness evinces a closer affinity of the oral tradition with the later English romance than with the earlier English or the French, but no filiation. And were filiation to be accepted there would remain the question of priority. It is often assumed without a misgiving, that oral tradition must needs be younger than anything that was committed to writing some centuries ago ; but this requires in each case to be made out ; there is certainly no antecedent probability of that kind.' (Child, I, 193).

Professor Schofield's opinion about the source of Chaucer's *Franklin's Tale* is hardly more acceptable than his views concerning the *Pearl* and the *Horn* ballads. He states the case too confidently when he says that 'there is every reason to accept the poet's assertion regarding his source ; he had almost certainly a definite French lay before him, which he followed in all essentials of his narrative, though as was his wont, he introduced digressions to a considerable extent' (p. 194). The author might have profited more than he seems to have done from Pio Rajna's extended and brilliant criticism of his article on the *Franklin's Tale*.² One may rather confidently say, at least, that Chaucer knew Boccaccio's story and particularly the form of it that appears in the *Filocolo*. Mr. Karl Young, in an important paper in *Modern Philology*,³ has, indeed, demonstrated Chaucer's use of the

¹ *Publ. M. L. A.*, XVIII, p. 78. Schofield here misquotes Child in the passage : 'The likeness evinces a closer affinity of the oral traditions with the later English or the French, but no filiation.' The quotation is correctly given above.

² *Publ. M. L. A.*, XVI, 405 ff. Pio Rajna's article is in *Romania*, XXXII, 204 ff.

³ *Modern Philology*, IV, 169 ff.

Filocolo in the *Troilus and Cressida*. Mr. Root is certainly near the truth when he says that 'the fact that the scene was laid in Brittany would be sufficient to explain the fanciful attribution to a Breton *lai*.' ¹

But these are matters of opinion, and in matters of opinion Professor Schofield is a free lance. For this reason, in part, his publications are invariably interesting. Then, too, although he keeps the philological faith, he is never simply the 'Herculean raker.' His style, though not always precise, is agreeable. He never, however, like Professor Saintsbury, forgets the difference between literary history and *causerie*. On account, then, of its reasonable arrangement, pleasant English, and substantial scholarship, the *English Literature From the Norman Conquest to Chaucer* is a book highly creditable to its author.

H. S. V. JONES.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

Analecta Germanica. Hermann Paul zum 7. August 1906 dargebracht von Anton Glock, Arthur Frey, Friedrich Wilhelm, P. Expeditus Schmidt, Michael Birkenbihl, Alois Dreyer. Amberg, H. Böes, 1906. 392 + 16 S. 4°. M 10,00.

Einem guten alten deutschen Brauche folgend hat sich eine Anzahl ehemaliger Mitglieder des unter Leitung Hermann Pauls stehenden deutschen Seminars der Universität München zusammengetan, um dem bewährten und verehrten Lehrer, der ja einer der vornehmsten und verdientesten Führer auf dem Gebiete der deutschen Philologie ist, zum 60. Geburtstage eine Reihe von Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen in Form einer Festgabe darzubringen. Ist auch die Zahl der Mitarbeiter im Verhältnis zu den Vielen, die Pauls Seminarübungen im Laufe der Jahrzehnte gehört haben, bescheiden, so ist doch die Leistung ihrem geistigen und wissenschaftlichen Gehalt nach in der Hauptsache trefflich gelungen, und sie wird zweifellos dem Gefeierten Freude und Genugtuung bereiten haben. Ganz besonders ist auch die gediegene, ja kostbare Aus-

¹ R. K. Root, *The Poetry of Chaucer*, p. 274.